

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 715

JC 830 350

AUTHOR Woodfaulk, Courtney S.
 TITLE An Investigation of the Current Practices for
 Preparing Florida Public Community College Students
 in Communication and Computation Skills.
 PUB DATE 28 Jul 82
 NOTE 26p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
 Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Developmental Studies Programs;
 Educational Quality; Educational Responsibility;
 Higher Education; Program Effectiveness; *Remedial
 Programs; *School Responsibility; State Legislation;
 State Surveys; *Statewide Planning; Universities
 IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

Recent efforts to identify and meet the needs for remedial education in Florida's public community colleges and universities are described in this paper. First, a synthesis of the literature on remedial education yields the following recommendations: (1) skills training must be integrated into other college experiences; (2) cognitive skills training must be combined with social and emotional development; (3) staff should be selected for their interest, commitment, and knowledge about learning problems; (4) degree credit should be granted for remedial classes; and (5) remediation should be approached with flexibility. The paper then reviews a variety of research, planning, and legislative activities concerned with postsecondary remediation efforts in Florida, including the inclusion of remedial programs in the statewide plan for postsecondary education; the assignment of specific responsibilities to Florida's public universities and community colleges; State Board Rule 6A-10.30, which requires college students to successfully complete 12 semester hours of course work in English and 6 hours in mathematics; a statewide review of basic skills preparation in Florida's community colleges; and a Florida Developmental Education Association survey of the effectiveness of remedial education at the community college level. Additional recommendations, incorporating L. R. Meeth's principles for quality in remediation, are included in the paper. (LL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED232715

Courtney S. Woodfaulk,
Associate Professor
Claflin College
Orangeburg, South Carolina
29115

**An Investigation of The Current Practices
for Preparing Florida Public Community College Students
in Communication and Computation Skills**

Ph.D. Student
Florida State University

Summer 1982

July 28, 1982

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Courtney Woodfaulk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

JC 830 350

**An Investigation of The Current Practices
for Preparing Florida Public Community College Students
in Communication and Computation Skills**

American higher education has been in the business of addressing remedial education for almost a century. Remedial education is not a new phenomenon, contrary to popular opinion. Wellesly College, in 1894, introduced its first course in remediation for academic deficiencies. In the historical analysis of the literature on remediation, two issues stand out. First, the perceived "causes" of poor academic performance have changed over the years, with one or another of the causes tending to be predominant at certain periods in history. Second, evaluation of the effectiveness of remedial efforts has undergone several developments.

A synthesis of the literature of the last thirty years reveals five major conclusions, which can be stated as recommendation for the future, (Cross, 1977).

1. Skills training must be integrated into the other college experiences of the student. We have known for years that "transfer of training " does not take place automatically. Bridges must be consciously and carefully built, so that the communications skills learned in remedial English, for example, carry over to the term paper for social studies.

2. Cognitive skills training must be integrated with the social and emotional development of the student. Reading specialist Maxwell (1971) writes: "We are very doubtful that exposure to a reading-improvement course, to a pacer or tachistoscope or to study

techniques - without intensive counseling - will change these students' habits or enhance their chances of succeeding academically" (p. 361), and "the college reading specialist needs to understand the dynamics of personality, motivation, and interpersonal relationships and study skills behavior" (p. 422). In short, academic achievement or lack of it is not a purely cognitive matter. The faculty member who claims that his or her responsibility is limited to the "mind" of the student should not be working with new students. Indeed, such a parochial view of the teaching function is so unrealistic in the light of everything we know about human learning that it is hard to defend even for highly motivated graduate students.

3. Staff working with remedial students should be selected for their interest and commitment as well as for their knowledge about learning problems. Education generally, and community college education in particular, has come a long way in recognizing the multiple causes of poor academic performance. In five years' time, Roueche and his associates (Roueche, 1968b; Roueche and Kirk, 1973) found a great difference in the characteristics of faculty members working with remedial students. In 1968, inexperienced teachers with low status, approached the teaching of New Students as an "onerous" task. By 1973, many experienced faculty members, committed to working with the whole student, were gaining satisfaction from-as one psychology instructor put it- "working with those students who have never done well before" (Roueche and Kirk, 1973, p.63). Even committed faculty, however, cannot do the job without knowledge and skill. The need for the special skills of the counseling staff

cannot be overemphasized. In some phases of the developmental program, the counseling staff will assume primary responsibility. In other phases they will need to work closely with individual faculty members and departments in the development of a viable program that takes account of the whole student.

So far, we have discussed primarily the integration of the work of two educational specialists-teaching faculty and counselors. Increasingly, community colleges are beginning to combine these functions and to develop specialists in remediation. In a survey conducted by K. Patricia Cross, May 1970 indicated that half of the community colleges had specialists in remediation on the staff; by 1974, 61 percent of the remedial teachers had special training for working with underprepared students. Frequently these specialists are present or former teaching faculty from the field of English and mathematics who have assumed most of the responsibility for working with new students on skill development. The unique value of these specialists is obvious. This represents most vividly our awareness of the need for integration of cognitive and social-emotional dimensions of students. Increasingly, they are likely to have specialized training in counseling and remediation as well as in their academic discipline (Cross 1977).

4. Degree credit should be granted for remedial classes. The students most in need of remediation are those who have found little meaning or little satisfaction in education. Initially at least, the major "reward" that education has to offer these students is college credit. Ultimately, all students may come to appreciate the personal

satisfactions of learning; until then, new students, more than other students, need the immediate and tangible reward of credit. The defense of no credit for below-college-level work is, in the opinion of the writer, to lower standards and to cheapen college degrees. But we may be protecting standards that do not exist. We already know that what is senior-level performance in one institution is below the level of acceptable freshman performance in another; furthermore, it is highly unlikely that A and B students have been or will be hurt by the granting of credit for remedial courses. While college credit for below-college-level work may threaten institutional egos, it should not threaten the egos of **educators** whose task it is to help students learn. In any event, the trend is toward credit, and most of the recent literature advocates granting credit for remedial or developmental courses. In 1970, less than one third of the community colleges were granting degree credit for remedial courses; by 1974, 53 percent were granting degree credit and 42 percent were granting nondegree credit.

5. Remediation should be approached with flexibility and open-mindedness. There is still much that we do not know. We do not even know which skills developed to what level are important to academic survival. Present definitions are arbitrary, consisting primarily of normative measures of what most college freshmen can do. Furthermore, our knowledge is frustratingly inconsistent. Some very slow readers, for example, get high grades in college; and some students with all the skills presumed necessary for success fail miserably. We do know that self-confidence is a major ingredient of success, and remedial courses have the potential for building or

destroying self-confidence. Showing a student that he can develop skills to a high level of mastery may be more worthwhile for its impact on affect than for its cognitive results. At the time, an overemphasis on the importance of skill development may do considerable damage by convincing some students that even with all the help and kindness in the world they do not accomplish academic tasks at a pace or level comparable to those of their classmates. We need to determine the kind of level of academic skills that are essential to life in our complicated society, and to try to help each student accomplish these basics-which are probably much less complicated than we presently assume. But beyond that, we might do better to create valid alternatives to the traditional academic curricula - alternatives that will enhance the contributions of individuals and add diversity to our international talent bank.

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission for the State of Florida, as an advisory board, has recognized the significant problem of students entering Florida public colleges and universities who lack sufficient communication or computation skills to succeed. On May 20, 1982, the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC), approved a report "Meeting Student Needs for Remedial Education in Florida Colleges and Universities". The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission was charged in enabling legislation(s. 240.147(2),FS) to include consideration of "the need for remedial education" in the master plan for postsecondary education which the Commission submitted to the State Board. This report describes recent efforts to identify the needs for remedial education in Florida public colleges and universities, and proposes recom-

mendations which outline a coherent state policy for addressing the needs of underprepared and underachieving students in a manner consistent with current efforts at quality improvement.

Specific responsibilities for implementing these tasks are assigned by statute to the Commissioner of Education (s.229.551(3)(g)(h)(i), FS), the Florida Board of Regents(BOR) (s. 240.233(5), FS), and Florida public community college district boards of trustees (s. 240 319(3)(c)(p)(q)(r), FS).

The College-Level Academic Skills Program (CLASP), is currently making efforts to address the problem of underprepared and underachieving students. State Board Rules define essential communication and computation skills (6A-10.31), describe procedures for assessing these skills (6A-10.311), provide for the establishment of minimum standards (6A-10.312) and assign specific responsibilities to Florida public community colleges and state universities (6A-10.313). A competency-based test of the 112 identified communication and computation skills has been developed to be administered to all sophomore students in Florida public community colleges and state universities beginning in the Fall semester, 1982. Beginning in August, 1984, successful completion of minimum standards of performance on this test will be required for awarding of the Associate of Arts degree and for admission to State University System upper division programs.

Another significant recent effort to improve student communication and computation skills is embodied in State Board Rule 6A-10.30. This rule requires Florida public community college and state

university students to successfully complete twelve semester hours of English coursework in which the student is required to demonstrate writing skills, and six semester hours of mathematics coursework at the level of college algebra or higher, or an alternative course plan approved by the State Board, prior to receipt of an Associate of Arts degree or entry to an upper-division program, beginning in Spring semester. 1983.

In order to evaluate current practices for preparing Florida public community college students in communication and computation skills, and to foster improvement of current practices, the BOR and the Division of Community Colleges engaged eighteen out-of-state consultants to conduct a state wide review of these activities at the twenty-eight community colleges. The Division of Community Colleges perceives the study more as a valuable evaluation of current efforts. The Division reports that significant and broad-ranging changes in curriculum and testing are currently underway at many community colleges in response to State Board Rule 6A-10.30 and the advent of the Sophomore Test.

Florida Developmental Education Association/community colleges did a survey to help determine the present status and effectiveness of compensatory/developmental/remedial education in Florida's community colleges (appendix A). This paper extracted from the survey items number 22-25 and 35-28 and ran cross tabs of the data (appendix B, which reveals similarities in approach and effectiveness). The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission engaged Dr. L.R. Meeth to analyze the remedial education needs of Florida postsecondary education students. Dr. Meeth's findings and suggestions are

included in his report to the Commission entitled "Alternatives for Florida's Underprepared College Students." Dr. Meeth's guidelines and principles for quality remedial education and many of his suggestions are incorporated in the recommendations which follow.

1. The Articulation Coordinating Committee established by State Board Rule (6A-10.24(14)), with the addition of representatives of K-12 education, especially secondary schools, should identify those academic skills which should be acquired in the K-12 sector (pre-college) and those skills which are truly college-level. Florida colleges, universities, and schools should then arrange their respective curricula to ensure that instruction in those skills identified as pre-college is provided in the schools, and instruction in those skills identified as college-level is provided by the community colleges and lower-division undergraduate programs at the state universities. (It should be noted that those skills identified as college-level are actually sophomore-level). This process is a necessary first step in diminishing postsecondary education's role in remedial education.
2. Performance standards for those communication and computation skills necessary to begin college-level work should be defined and made clear to the schools.
3. By 1990, the K-12 sector should have primary responsibility for insuring that students have met the standards for communication or computation skills identified as pre-college, those skills appropriate and necessary for students who plan to enter college.
4. In the meantime, the state should finance a transitional program between K-12 and postsecondary education which allow students to remedy deficiencies in those essential skills identified as necessary to begin college-level work (pre-college). This remedial transitional program should be offered in Florida public community colleges, should be distinct from college-parallel programs, and should be phased-out by 1990.
5. Entrance to all non-vocational forms of postsecondary education, including admission to college-parallel programs in community colleges, should be limited to students who meets at least minimum standards for those essential skills identified as appropriate for college freshmen (pre-college skills).
6. All Florida public community colleges and state universities should require entering students to complete an assessment test to measure levels of attainment of communication and computation skills. Students should be placed in courses according to this assessment, and those students found to be

underprepared in academic skills should be required to successfully complete remedial courses before proceeding in those areas. Within the students' abilities, they should, however, be allowed to take regular college courses in other curriculum areas. In this way, the students in remedial courses are not "tracked" and isolated from the mainstram. All remedial courses should require exit examinations. After 1990, these courses should be limited to the provision of remedial education for students deficient in college-level skills including those who have been unsuccessful at passing the sophomore test, and remedial education for students with special needs, such as older, returning students. By 1990, primary responsibility for pre-college level skills should be assumed by the K-12 sector, with exception of those students with special needs mentioned above.

7. Florida public community colleges should have primary responsibility for providing remedial courses for postsecondary education students diagnosed as underprepared in college-level academic skills.
8. Those Florida public community colleges responsible for developmental education programs for adults, as negotiated with their local district school boards through the Regional Coordinating Councils, should continue to be responsible for these programs.
9. When the current crisis in underpreparation and underachievement has passed, state universities should have only a limited role in providing remedial courses. Universities should provide for remedial assistance for members of minority groups, students whose native language is not English, and other students with special needs such as mathematics anxiety. Universities should be encouraged to engage local feeder community colleges to provide this remedial assistance, as the University of Central Florida has engaged Valencia Community College to provide remedial mathematics instruction. In those cases where universities have established notable remedial programs of their own, such as the reading and writing skills laboratory at Florida State University and the developmental mathematics program at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, these programs should be continued and encouraged.
10. Community college should be allowed to award academic credit to students for remedial courses but such credit should not be counted toward meeting requirements for associate degrees or for meeting the requirements of State Board Rule 6A-10.30.
11. The Commission encourages Florida postsecondary institutions to consider implementing the principles and guidelines for remedial education programs, recognizing that individual institutions can assess best the needs of their students and how resources should be directed to meet those needs.
12. Until the current levels of student underpreparation and

underachievement are abated and proposed changes are effected in the K-12 sector, the state should provide adequate funding to Florida public community colleges and universities for the transitional program of remedial education in pre-college skills mentioned in recommendation 4, and for remedial education in college-level skills for those students who are unsuccessful on the sophomore test or who have special needs. Adequate funding also should be provided to enhance quality instruction at the freshman and sophomore levels in college-level communication and computation skills.

13. The CLASP consultants cited the mathematics skills development program at Florida Agriculture and Mechanical University as "innovative" and "exemplary," but they noted that current and anticipated demand for the program exceeds its capabilities and they recommended increased funding for additional staff and for staff development. To further the state's goal of increased minority participation in postsecondary education while providing quality remedial education, quality improvement funds should be provided to enhance the development of this program and to assure that information on the program is distributed to all Florida's postsecondary education institutions.
14. Community colleges should dedicate an adequate portion of staff development funds for faculty to obtain sufficient in-service training to provide quality remedial education programs.
15. Reasonable standards and time limitations should be placed on students to ensure that they do not remain in remedial education programs indefinitely. As Miami-Dade Community College has recognized, at some point nonachieving students must be notified that society has made a full effort on their behalf and no further help will be provide.

Research indicate that the program is succeeding in improving student performance and in aiding students who began without necessary skills.

A similar survey was done by Cross (1977). The survey was mailed in October 1974 to a 20 percent random sample of two-year colleges listed in the 1973 Community and Junior College Directory. Responses were received from 184 colleges for an 84 percent return. The survey was, for the most part, a repeat of a survey mailed to a 20 percent random sample of two-year colleges in 1970. While the colleges were not necessarily the same colleges, the data are believed to present

an accurate picture of the changes taking place between 1970 and 1974 in programs for low achievers in two-year colleges. Florida public community colleges, state universities, the Articulation Coordination Committee, the State Board of Education, and the Florida Legislature have all taken important steps toward alleviation of the current problems of underpreparation and underachievement of Florida postsecondary education students. Although Florida has armed itself to combat the problem of the low-achiever, the question always surfaces, **who is responsible?** Students who spent the most formative years of their lives in the bottom third of the class begin to think of themselves as "below-average" people. Glasser has been forthright in his charge that the schools **cause** the failure. In the introduction to his well-known School Without Failure (1969, p. XIII) he writes, "Much has been written on the difficulties of improving education in the central city. From personal experience, I believe that most people who write about these schools have not raised the critical issue. They have been so obsessed with the social, environmental, and cultural factors affecting students that they have not looked deeply enough into the role education itself has played in causing students to fail, not only in the central city but in all schools." Later in the book, he makes the blunt assertion "Very few children come to school failures, none come labeled failures; it is school and school alone which pins the label failures on children" (p.26).

Bloom (1971a, pp. 14-15, 22) is not as incensed and angry as Glasser, but his conclusions are the same.

In school, the likelihood is that each student will be judged many times each day in terms of his adequacy relative to others in his

class, group, or school. No matter how well he does, if others do better, he must come to know it and to place himself accordingly...

We do not know what level of objective success or failure will be interpreted by the individual as success or failure. But, in general, we believe that to be in the top third or top quarter of his class group (grades of A and B) over a number of years in a variety of school subjects is likely to be interpreted by the student as adequate or as success. Also, we believe [that] to be in the bottom third or quarter of his class group (grades D and F) over a number of years must leave the individual with a negative self-view, at least in the academic area.

Torshen (1969) has summarized the studies showing relationships between self-concept and school achievement. While the correlation between total self-concept and school achievement is of the order of +.25, the correlation between academic self-concept and school achievement is about +.50. It is evident in these studies that the academic self-concept is relatively clearly defined by the end of the primary school period. These correlations indicate that for students at the extremes (upper and lower third) on academic achievement, the relationship between achievement and academic self-concept is very strong, with little overlap in academic self-concept between these extreme groups. That is, students in the lower third of the achievement distribution tend to have negative self-concepts while students in the upper third tend to have positive self-concepts.

Bloom (1971b) claims that 95 percent of the students can attain mastery of most school learning tasks if they are given sufficient time and appropriate types of help.

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission for the state of Florida advocates that the responsibility for instruction in pre-college academic skills belongs in the K-12 sector, and the responsibility for remedial education in college-level academic skills belongs primarily in the community colleges. Remedial programs in universities should be limited to assistance for small groups of students with special needs. Until this goal is achieved, however, remedial education programs for all levels of skills are essential, should be provided in a rigorous and quality manner, and should be funded accordingly.

Bibliography

- Bloom, B.S. Affective Consequences of School Achievement. In J.H. Block(ed), Mastery Learning: Theory and Practice, New York: Holt, 1971a.
- Bloom, B.S. Mastery Learning. In J.H. Block (ed), Mastery Learning: Theory and Practice, New York: Holt, 1971b.
- Cross, K. Patricia, Accent on Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Glasser, W. School Without Failure, New York: Harper, 1969.
- Maxwell, M.J. "The Role of Attitudes and Emotions in Changing Reading and Study Behavior of College Students", Journal of Reading, March 1971, 14(6), pp.359-423.
- Roueche, J.E. "The Open-Door College: The Problem of The Lower Achiever." Journal of Higher Education, Nov. 1968a, 39, 453-456.
- Roueche, J.E. "Salvage, Redirection, or Custody?" Washington, D.C: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968b.
- Roueche, J.E. "Accommodating Individual Differences", Community College Review, July-Aug. 1973, 1, 24-29.
- Roueche, J.E., and Kirk, R.W. Catching up: Remedial Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, "Meeting Students Needs For Remedial Education In Florida Colleges And Universities" Tallahassee, Florida, April 27, 1982. (Typewritten.)

APPENDIX A

I. CONTEXT

1. Name of your college: _____
2. Is your college:
 - Multi-Campus _____
 - Single Campus _____
3. does your institution:

	YES	NO
A. Offer a special program for the academically disadvantaged or underprepared	_____	_____
B. Offer specific courses to meet the needs of the academically disadvantaged or underprepared	_____	_____
C. Offer specific services, e.g., tutoring, counseling, financial aid, for those who are academically disadvantaged or underprepared	_____	_____
D. Offer alternatives other than the above (If so, please specify) _____	_____	_____
4. How many unduplicated students were enrolled in your developmental program/course(s) during the 1980-81 academic year:
 - a. less than 25 _____
 - b. 25-224 _____
 - c. 225-424 _____
 - d. 425-624 _____
 - e. 625-824 _____
 - f. 825-999 _____
 - g. 1,000 or more _____

II. Philosophy

5. Is there a written statement describing the developmental philosophy of your institution?
 _____ Yes _____ No
6. Is the developmental philosophy of your institution made available to students? _____
 yes _____ No
7. Are there written learning objectives for the developmental program/course(s)?
 - a. Are the written learning objectives distributed to students _____ YES _____ NO

III. Rationale

8. The purpose of the developmental program/course(s) at your college is: YES NO
 - a. The development of academic survival skills, e.g., _____

- b. The development of self-concept, e.g., self esteem, aspiration, achievement motivation _____
- c. The development or provision of career awareness/exploration _____
- d. Other (please specify) _____

IV. Placement of Student

9. Please rank the methods you use in placing students into the developmental program/course(s). Rank on the basis of frequency used where the highest rank is one.

- a. Testing _____
- b. Previous educational records _____
- c. Self-referral _____
- d. Teacher referral _____
- e. Counseling _____
- f. Other (please specify) _____

10. Are all degree-seeking incoming students required to participate in placement testing?
 _____ YES _____ NO

11. What testing instruments do you commonly use for placement in program/course(s) for the academically disadvantaged or underprepared? Please check all that apply.

- a. ACT _____
- b. SAT _____
- c. Nelson Denny Reading Test
 (what form _____) _____
- d. The Nelson Reading Test _____
- e. Stanford Achievement Test I _____
- f. A Self-concept Test _____
- g. A Personality Test _____
- h. Locally Designed Test _____
- i. Comparative Guidance Placement Test _____
- j. Writing Sample _____
- k. Other (please specify) _____

12. Do you offer diagnostic testing within the developmental program/course(s)? YES NO

If so, please list the name(s) of the instrument(s) below:

13. On the basis of your placement criteria, are certain students required to enroll in your developmental program/course(s)? YES NO

14. On the basis of your placement criteria, are certain

students recommended to enroll in your developmental program/course(s)? _____

V. Organizational Structure

15. Which one of the following descriptions represents your present developmental studies organizational structure: (please check)

- a. _____ Isolated developmental courses in discipline curricula, i.e., English department is responsible for developmental English
- b. _____ An interdisciplinary group of instructors who remain attached to their disciplines organizationally, but who coordinate with instructors from other disciplines and with counselors assigned to compensatory students.
- c. _____ A department of developmental studies which plans and implements developmental instruction.
- d. _____ Other (please specify) _____

16. Is there a separate budget provided for the areas in item 15 _____ YES
_____ NO. If so, please indicate which one:

- 15(a) _____ 15(c) _____
15(b) _____ 15(d) _____

17. What developmental courses are offered at your college? Please check all that apply.

- a. Reading _____
- b. Mathematics _____
- c. English _____
- d. Study Skills/Life Skills/Coping Skills _____
- e. Psychology _____
- f. Biology _____
- g. Other (please specify) _____

18. What type of credit is awarded for the developmental courses or programs.
Please circle the appropriate letter: T=Transfer credit, NT=Nontransfer credit,
NC=No credit:

- | | | | |
|--------------------|---|----|----|
| 17(a) Reading | T | NT | NC |
| 17(b) Mathematics | T | NT | NC |
| 17(c) English | T | NT | NC |
| 17(d) Study Skills | T | NT | NC |
| 17(e) Psychology | T | NT | NC |
| 17(f) Biology | T | NT | NC |
| 17(g) Other | T | NT | NC |

19. Please list the courses prefix and numbers for each courses you checked in item number 17 above.

- a. Reading _____
- b. Mathematics _____
- c. English _____

- d. Study Skills _____
- e. Psychology _____
- f. Biology _____
- g. Other _____

VI. Support Services

- | | Yes | No |
|--|-------|-------|
| 20. Does your institution have a learning laboratory with provisions for developmental students? | _____ | _____ |
| 21. Is it supervised by a full-time administrator(s) | _____ | _____ |
| 22. Is it staffed by an instructional staff such as the following? | | |
| a. full-time professionals | _____ | _____ |
| b. part-time professionals | _____ | _____ |
| c. para-professionals | _____ | _____ |
| d. peer tutors | _____ | _____ |
| e. teaching interns | _____ | _____ |
| 23. Does your institution utilize a counseling staff such as the following? | | |
| a. full-time professionals (exclusively for developmental students) | _____ | _____ |
| b. full-time professionals (not exclusively for developmental students) | _____ | _____ |
| c. part-time professionals | _____ | _____ |
| d. para-professionals | _____ | _____ |

VII. Curriculum

- | | YES | NO |
|---|-------|-------|
| 24. Is your developmental program/course(s) characterized by: | | |
| a. a year long program | _____ | _____ |
| b. full semester | _____ | _____ |
| c. less than a semester | _____ | _____ |
| d. open end/open exit | _____ | _____ |
| 25. Are your developmental instructional practices characterized by | | |
| a. providing students with course goals and objectives at the beginning of the semester | _____ | _____ |
| b. providing a variety of assessment methods other than pencil and paper | _____ | _____ |
| c. using test items which are developed from stated objectives | _____ | _____ |

d. basing pre-test of deficient skills and the provision of materials and instruction necessary to remediate deficiencies

e. allowing more than one term to complete a courses

VIII. Staffing

26. Are instructors in developmental courses:

a. individuals who have chosen this assignment

b. specially trained in instructional techniques

c. specially trained in counseling techniques

d. volunteers

IX. Evaluation

27. Do you have a program evaluation system for your developmental program/course(s)?

28. Is the above developmental program/course(s) mentioned in item number 27, characterized by:

a. follow-up records

b. retention/attrition records

c. grade-point average

d. attitudinal measures

e. self-concept measures

f. pre and post testing

g. control group

29. how many students completed the program/course during 1980-81 academic year?

a. 90% or more

b. 80%-89%

c. 70%-79%

d. 60%-68%

e. 50%-59%

f. 40%-49%

g. less than 40%

30. How many developmental students persist to second semester of college?

a. 90%-or more

b. 80%-89%

c. 70%-79%

d. 60%-69%

e. 50%-59%

f. 40%-49%

g. less than 40%

31. How many developmental students eventually complete an Associate in Arts program?

- a. 90% or more
- b. 80%-89%
- c. 70%-79%
- d. 60%-69%
- e. 50%-59%
- f. 40%-49%
- g. less than 40%

32. How many developmental students eventually complete an Associate in Science program?

- a. 90% or more
- b. 80%-89%
- c. 70%-79%
- d. 60%-69%
- e. 50%-59%
- f. 40%-49%
- g. less than 40%

33. How many developmental students eventually complete a certificate program?

- a. 90% or more
- b. 80%-89%
- c. 70%-79%
- d. 60%-69%
- e. 50%-59%
- f. 40%-49%
- g. less than 40%

34. How do developmental students compare academically with other students in the institution after completing the developmental program/course(s)?

- a. better
- b. same as
- c. worse

35. What is the graduation rate of developmental students as compared with other students?

- a. better
- b. same as
- c. worse

X. Respondent

36. Name _____

37. Title:

- a. Dean
- b. Assistant Dean
- c. Director

- d. Assistant Director
- e. Coordinator
- f. Counselor
- g. Instructor
- h. Other

38. length of time in present position:

- a. 1 year or less
- b. 1-2 years
- c. 2-3 years
- d. 3-4 years
- e. 4 years or more

39. Number of contacts made to complete survey?

- a. self only
- b. records
- c. one other person
- d. two other persons
- e. three other persons
- f. four or more persons

Please attach a bibliography of the materials used in your developmental program/course(s).

Please attach any in-house research conducted on your developmental program/course(s).

APPENDIX B

Staffing, Evaluation and how many students completed the program/course during 1980-81 academic year
Cross Tabs

Table of Long By STEG

LONG	STFG								
FREQUENCY									
PERCENT									
ROW PCT									
COL PCT	A	AB	AB D	ABC	ABCD	BC	D	TOTAL	
A C	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
	. 0.00	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55	
	. 0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
	. 0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
ABCD	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
	. 0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55	
	. 0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
	. 0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
B	0	1	3	0	3	1	2	11	
	. 4.55	13.64	0.00	13.64	4.55	9.09	4.55	50.00	
	. 9.09	27.27	0.00	27.27	9.09	18.18	9.09		
	. 33.33	37.50	0.00	75.00	100.00	66.67	100.00		
B D	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	
	. 4.55	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55	0.00	13.64	
	. 33.33	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00		
	. 33.33	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00		

BCD	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	.	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55
	.	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
C	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	.	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55
	.	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
NNY	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	.	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55
	.	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
NYNN	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	.	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55
	.	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
NYNY	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	.	4.55	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.09
	.	50.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	.	33.33	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL	.	3	8	2	4	1	3	1	22
	.	13.64	36.36	9.09	18.18	4.55	13.64	4.55	100.00

APPENDIX B
CROSS TABS REQUESTED
TABLE OF COLTYP BY STAF C

COLTYP	STAF C							TOTAL
FREQUENCY PERCENT ROW PCT COL PCT	A	A D	AB	B	B D	BC	BCD	
M	1 4.35 8.33 100.00	1 4.35 8.33 50.00	1 4.35 8.33 50.00	6 26.09 50.00 54.55	2 8.70 16.67 50.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 4.35 8.33 100.00	12 52.17
S	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 4.35 9.09 50.00	1 4.35 9.09 50.00	5 21.74 45.45 45.45	2 8.70 18.18 50.00	2 8.70 18.18 100.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	11 47.83
TOTAL	1 4.35	2 8.70	2 8.70	11 47.39	4 17.39	2 8.70	1 4.35	23 100.00

Colleges

DAYTONA
JAX/NORTH
FLA. KEYS
INDIAN RIVER
MIAMI
OKLA.-WALTON

EDISON
JAX/DOWNTOWN
GULF
LAKE-SUMTER
MIAMI, SOUTH
PALM BEACH

JAX/SOUTH
JAX/KENT
HILLSBOROUGH
MANATEE
NORTH FLORIDA
PASCO-HERNADO

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

SEP 2 1983